

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the amendments, herein, and the following remarks:

The following claims were previously *pending*: 1-16.

The following claims are currently *pending*: 1-17

The following claims are *independent*: 1, 8, 11 and 17.

The following claims have previously been *withdrawn*: 4-7.

Please *add new* claim 17 and please *amend* claims 1, 8 and 11; although these claims have been amended herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices (hereinafter “amendment,” “amendments,” and/or “amended”), Applicant submits that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserves the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation/divisional application(s). Applicant submits that these new claim and/or claim amendments are supported throughout the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by May, US Patent No. 6,317,727 (hereinafter “May”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that a showing of anticipation has not been made and that May does not discuss every element of the previously pending claims. In particular, Applicant maintains that May does not anticipate or discuss at least the following claimed elements as recited, *inter alia*, in previously pending independent claim 1:

... receive a template for screening said received data identifying said at least a first reference obligation ... screen said received data according to the received template identifying said reference entity for accuracy

However, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to provide further clarification and as such, Applicant submits that the amended claim elements of independent claim 1 are also not anticipated or discussed by May. For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

... receive data identifying at least a first reference obligation associated with said derivative transaction;

provide a reference obligation information template for screening said received data identifying said at least a first reference obligation;

identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation;

screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents

With respect to the previously pending claim elements, the Office Action asserts the following:

May clearly discloses "receiving templates" in, for example, Figures 9A, 9B, 10, 14A, 20, 22A, etc.

May clearly discloses "screening received data within said templates for accuracy" in, for example, Col. 39, lines 36-40, i.e. before pressing the Apply button (381). Further, Figure 26, step (526) provides for verifying the trade eligibility of the respective first and second users, which inherently includes screening for accuracy because if the user has inaccurately filled out the proper information then they will not be matched up and would therefore be ineligible to participate in the transaction.

Another way to look at the limitation "screening for accuracy" may be found within the input mechanisms themselves, e.g. Figure 14A requires a price and a quantity. If either of these is missing or inaccurate, the system/process cannot continue because improper parameters have been entered. That is, the templates themselves are screening for accurate data to be entered into the appropriate fields at the time of entry.

...
The Examiner construes the teaching of "The user is not allowed at this point to increase the quantity figure because the counterparty has already indicated the Quantity they are desiring to sell." as requiring the form to be screened for accuracy in that the system prevents users from increasing the quantity figure. (See Office Action, pgs. 4-5, § 3; original emphasis).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of May and submits that May does not anticipate or discuss at least the noted claim elements of amended independent claim 1.

Instead of discussing the claimed elements, Applicant submits that May discusses a user's confirmation of accuracy of the user-provided information associated with an order. For example, Applicant notes May's discussion that "... the trader manually input his/her position (i.e., interest rate risk portfolio) into the switch module 80 ..." (May, col. 39, lines 32-36) and "[o]nce a portfolio is inputted, the user must confirm its accuracy by selecting the Apply button 381 before the positions can be used in the switch mechanism 35 ..." (May, col. 39, lines 37-40). Furthermore, Applicant disagrees that May's FIG. 14A (cited by the

Examiner) is relevant to the claimed elements as May's Fig. 14A simply discusses a user editable field - "the passive order interface 294 (FIG. 14A) then prompts the trader with a quantity and price which the trader may modify." (May, col. 40, lines 63-65). Applicant submits that such discussion suggests that trader input is variable and acceptable as long as it is a "reasonable" input as discussed in May. Specifically May discusses "system checks any new order for reasonableness ... as they [orders] are placed. For example, a bid cannot be higher than the existing offer without the user double checking." (May, col. 34, lines 60-63).

However, Applicant submits that May's user double checking information provided by a trader or providing input that is "reasonable" does not in any way anticipate or render obvious at least the claimed "... receive data identifying at least a first reference obligation ... provide a reference obligation information template for screening said received data identifying ... identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation [and] screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template ... for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents ..." as recited in amended independent claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that may does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed elements of the amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

Should the Examiner reject the amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide specific citations and explanations describing how each and every element of the pending claims are allegedly anticipated by the cited reference,

providing indications of specific, alleged correspondences between claim elements and cited portions of the applied reference. More specifically, Applicant respectfully requests, in the event of rejection, clarification as to what in May allegedly corresponds to the rejected claim elements.

Independent Claim 8

Although of different scope than amended independent claim 1, Applicant submits amended independent claim 8 is also patentable over May, for at least similar reasons. For example, amended independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*:

A processor-readable medium storing a plurality of processing instructions, comprising issuable instructions by a processor to:

... receive data identifying at least a first reference obligation associated with said derivative transaction;

provide a reference obligation information template for screening said received data identifying said at least a first reference obligation;

identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation;

screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents

Applicant respectfully submits that at least these claim elements recited in amended independent claim 8 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by May for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in May with regard to the amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

Independent Claim 11

Although of different scope than amended independent claims 1 and 8, Applicant submits amended independent claim 11 is also patentable over May, for at least similar reasons. For example, amended independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*:

A processor-implemented method for supporting a derivative transaction, comprising:
... receiving data identifying at least a first reference obligation associated with said derivative transaction;
providing a reference obligation information template for screening said received data identifying said at least a first reference obligation;
identifying and providing one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation;
screening said received data according to the received reference obligation information template identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents

Applicant respectfully submits that at least these claim elements recited in amended independent claim 11 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by May for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in May with regard to the amended independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

Independent Claim 17

Although of different scope than amended independent claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicant submits amended independent claim 17 is also patentable over May, for at least similar reasons. For example, amended independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*:

A processor-implemented method for supporting a derivative transaction, comprising:
receiving by a processor a request to screen information associated with an agreement for a derivative transaction, said

information including reference obligation information and reference entity information;

... identifying, in response to the request, one or more associated electronic documents for screening said received reference entity and reference obligation information;

providing the identified one or more associated electronic documents for screening said received reference entity and reference obligation information;

screening said received reference entity and reference obligation information to verify accuracy of the received information by matching the received reference entity and reference obligation information with information from said one or more associated electronic documents

Applicant respectfully submits that at least these claim elements recited in amended independent claim 17 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by May for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in May with regard to the amended independent claims 1, 8 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

Dependent Claims

Applicant submits claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 12-16 which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are all patentable over May for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in May with regard to amended independent claims 1, 8, 11 and 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over May, US Patent No. 6,317,727 (hereinafter “May”), and in further view of Clark et al., US Patent No. 5,890,140 (hereinafter “Clark”).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and maintains that a *prima facie* showing of obviousness has not been made and that the references of record, taken alone or in combination, fail to discuss or render obvious every element of the previously pending claims. However, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to provide further clarification. As such, Applicant submits that the following claim elements of amended independent claim 1 are also not discussed or rendered obvious by the references of record, taken alone or in combination:

... identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation;
screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents

The Office Action maintains that the previously pending claim elements were allegedly discussed or rendered obvious by a combination of May and Clark and refers Applicant to the Office Action mailed on February 4, 2009, where the Examiner alleges:

If applicant is of the opinion that May does not disclose verifying or screening data for accuracy, then resort may be had to Clark et al. to show it is old and well known to do so at various points in a financial transaction sequence. See for example, Fig. 3., (check ID and Password, check sequence #, etc), Figures 16, 18, 19 and associated descriptive text, etc. See specifically Col. 20, lines 7+. (Office Action, February 4, 2009, p. 7, § 9; emphasis added).

Applicant, again, respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and submits that the Examiner is overgeneralizing the claimed elements as "verifying or screening data for accuracy." Applicant submits that Clark fails to remedy the deficiencies of May as discussed above in connection with the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection. Specifically, Applicant notes that

Clark discusses "validat[ing] the construction of the message and check[ing] the user's entitlements to insure that the message is in the proper format and that the user is entitled to the type of transaction requested for the particular account." (Clark, col. 10, lines 4-8). Furthermore, in the Examiner's cited portions, Clark discusses local or remote authorization where "the user simply selects the transactions from the list if transactions awaiting authorization." (See Clark, col. 20, lines 7+). Applicant submits that such "entitlement checking" for transactions, format validation and user authorization for transaction facilitation are fundamentally different from the claimed "... identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation" and "screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents" as recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims under 36 U.S.C. § 103, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide specific citations and explanations describing how each and every element of the pending claims are allegedly anticipated by the cited reference, providing indications of specific, alleged correspondences between claim elements and cited portions of the applied reference. More specifically, Applicant respectfully requests, in the event of rejection, clarification as to what in Clark allegedly corresponds to "... identify and provide one or more supporting electronic documents for screening said received data identifying said reference entity and said at least a first reference obligation" and "screen said received data according to the received reference obligation information template

identifying said at least a first reference obligation for accuracy by comparing said received data with information in said one or more supporting electronic documents ..." as explicitly recited in independent claim 1.

Although of different scope than amended independent claim 1, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 8, 11 and 17 are all patentable over the references of record, taken alone or in combination, for at least similar reasons as discussed above identifying deficiencies in the references of record with regard to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Applicant submits claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 12-16 which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are all patentable over the references of record for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in the references of record with regard to amended independent claims 1, 8, 11 and 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that the above remarks, which distinguish the claims over the cited reference(s), pertained only to noted claim element portions. These remarks are believed to be sufficient to overcome the prior art to this Office Action (and/or any previous office action(s)) (hereinafter "Office Action(s)"). While many other claim elements and/or bases for rejection were not discussed, as they have been rendered moot based on the above amendments and/or remarks, Applicant asserts that all such remaining and not discussed

claim elements and/or bases for rejection, all, also are distinguished over the prior art, and Applicant reserves the opportunity to more particularly traverse, remark and/or distinguish over any such remaining claim elements and/or bases for rejection at a later time, should it become necessary. Further, any remarks that were made in response to the Office Action(s)' objection and/or rejection as to any one claim element, and which may have been re-asserted as applying to other Office Action(s) objection(s) and/or rejection(s) as to any other claim element(s), any such re-assertion(s) of remarks are not meant to imply that there is commonality about the structure, functionality, means, operation, and/or scope of any of the claim element(s), and no such commonality is admitted as a consequence of any such re-assertion(s) of remarks. Consequently, the reference(s) cited the Office Action(s) do not result in the claimed invention(s), there was/is no motivation, basis and/or rationale for such a combination of references (i.e., cited references do not teach, read on, suggest, or result in the claimed invention(s)), and the claimed invention(s) are not admitted to be prior art. Also, Applicant does not accept, admit, and/or concede to any assertions, (mis)characterizations (e.g., of claims, references, and/or otherwise), and/or Official Notice(s) in the Office Action(s). As such, Applicant does not concede that any claim element(s) have been anticipated and/or rendered obvious by any of the cited reference(s) and/or any Official Notice in the Office Action(s). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the supporting remarks and claimed inventions, claims 1-3 and 8-16, all: overcome all rejections and/or objections as noted in the Office Action(s), are patentable over and discriminated from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and/or objection(s), and allowance of all claims.

Authorization

Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any additional fees that may be required for consideration of this and/or any accompanying and/or necessary papers to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-340. In the event that an extension of time is required (or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time), Applicant requests that the Commissioner grant a petition for an extension of time required to make this response timely, and, Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any fee or credit any overpayment for such an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-340.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of the application in any way, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorney(s) for Applicant,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

Dated: November 29, 2010

By: Walter G. Hanchuk
Walter G. Hanchuk
Registration No.: 35,179

Correspondence Address:

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112

212-408-5100 (Telephone)
212-541-5369 (Facsimile)
patents@chadbourne.com (E-mail)